

Appl. No. 09/390,362

Page 5

Reply to Office Action of: September 8, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the present application in the telephone interviews with John Orange (Reg. # 29,725) on December 5, 2005 and January 4, 2006.

Prior to the telephone interview of January 4, 2006, proposed amendments to claim 1 were furnished to the Examiner for consideration. The proposed amendments served to clarify the nature of the signature components, in particular identifying them as discrete signature components including *s* and *c*, and the plaintext bit string *V*. Reference numerals were also added to the claim for clarity. These amendments are reflected in the listing of claims above. In the telephone interview of January 4, 2006, the Examiner indicated that such amendments were sufficient to overcome the prior art references relied upon in the Final Office Action, in particular BP 0918274A2 to McCollom.

Applicant advises that similar amendments have been made to claim 7, directed to a method of verifying a message. Claims 2-6 and 8-13 have been amended consistent with the terminology used in claims 1 and 7.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCollom in view of Kitaori et al (US 5,915,024). As indicated above, it was established in the telephone interview of January 4, 2005 that the amendments to claim 1 overcome the McCollom reference. Kitaori fails to teach what is missing from McCollom, and therefore, claims 1 and 7 are believed to patentably distinguish over the combination thereof. Claims 6 and 11-13 being ultimately dependent on claim 1 are similarly distinguished.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-5 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over McCollom in view of various other prior art references, including Kitaori, Menezes (Handbook of Applied Cryptography), Nyberg (0639907A1), and ISO/IEC FCD 9796-1. Applicant advises that none of these references teach what is missing from McCollom, and as such, claims 2-5, 8-10 being ultimately dependent on either claim 1 or 7, patentably distinguish over the prior art cited.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13 submitted herewith clearly and patentably distinguish over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and as such are in condition

Best Available Copy

Appl. No. 09/390,362

Page 6


Reply to Office Action of: September 8, 2005

for allowance.

Applicant requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

In view of the finality of the rejections herein discussed, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact John Orange at 416-863-3164 should they wish to discuss the present application and/or the amendments made thereto.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph A. Dowell
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 26,868

Date:

1/5/2006

Best Available Copy